

Mondale

China: A test of Presidential Judgment

"In this election the Republicans seem to be running on two major planks. The first is their pro-worker policy, which comes down to blockbuster giveaways to the rich. And the second is the issue of national strength.

I want to talk about national strength for a moment. It means many things -- strong military defenses; arms control; energy security; a foreign policy based on American values -- and I'll be speaking about them all as this campaign moves along. But the element of national strength I want to emphasize this morning is presidential judgment.

Last week, Lane Kirkland -- the President of the AFL-CIO -- pointed out that few presidential elections in modern history offer such a stark contrast between the candidates as this one. In my speech to the New York State Federation, I'll be highlighting that contrast in two areas -- policies affecting working Americans, and foreign affairs.

The last ten days have given the American people an opportunity to assess the judgment of the Republican nominee for President. In his handling of an area of extreme sensitivity -- our relations with China -- he has stumbled into a public argument with the Chinese. He has proposed a change in our relations with Taiwan which is unnecessary, undesirable, and which carries with it potentially disastrous consequences to our national security. He has demonstrated his lack of understanding of the basic facts of the issue. And he has had a public disagreement with his running mate, who has returned in failure from his trip to Peking.

What Mr. Reagan has done, quite simply, is to propose a policy towards this delicate question which would turn the clock back, and recreate the conditions which made the Taiwan question a perennial source of tension both in Asia and in our political debate at home.

The central fact is this: President Carter's historic decision to complete the normalization process with the government of China in December 1978 has been a dramatic success. It has strengthened our strategic position throughout Asia and the Pacific, and with the government in Peking -- which represents one-fourth of the world's population.

Our gains with the mainland have been accomplished without damage to the basic prosperity, stability, and security of the people of Taiwan.

All this is jeopardized by Mr. Reagan's confused and misinformed positions. He says he does not want to turn the clock back -- but advocates creating an "official liaison" office on Taiwan. His proposal is a violation of the central fact around which the United States and China were able to construct both the Shanghai Communique issued by President Nixon and Chou EnLai in 1972, and the announcement of normalization made by President Carter and Premier Hua Guo Feng in December of 1978.

Mr. Reagan has taken a position which could seriously damage our national strength and give cheer to only one major nation -- the Soviet Union. He has demonstrated that he does not understand this sensitive issue.

Mr. Reagan offered us a "two China" policy. With Mr. Bush's trip, he now offers us two China policies. Neither situation will do.

In the coming days, they will no doubt issue clarifications and explanations. But no clarification will obscure the fact that in his first foray into the international arena since becoming his party's candidate, Mr. Reagan has repudiated the policies of the last three American Presidents -- two from his own party. It is an inauspicious way to open a campaign. It is a potentially disastrous way to run our nation's foreign policy, and I believe the American people will reject it in November."

New York AFL-CIO Convention
Monticello, New York
August 25, 1980

SOUTHERN AFRICA

Reagan

No where is Reagan's disregard for human rights more apparent than in southern Africa where Reagan perceives the confrontation as between Marxism and the principles of the West, rather than as an attempt by a disenfranchised majority to gain some measure of control over its destiny.

Reagan stated his appraisal of the election won by the reverend Abel Muzorewa which excluded Joshua Nkomo's ZANU and Robert Mugabe's ZAPU.

"The guerillas were determined to rule the country, and neither one of them could win an election."

Jefferson City Missouri Post
May 6, 1979

As for South Africa, Reagan favors a policy which ignores apartheid.

"Isn't it time we laid off South Africa for awhile?
...As for letting South Africans work at solving their problems while we solve our own, all in favor say 'Aye.'"

Radio Transcript
October 22, 1976

One of Reagan's advisors, Peter Duignan, claims Carter is too harsh with South Africa, giving blacks "unrealistic" expectations. (Christian Science Monitor, February 9, 1978)

Another advisor, Kenneth Adelman, states flatly that one man, one vote probably is not applicable to South Africa. (Christian Science Monitor, October 6, 1977)

Another advisor, Joseph Churba, would go so far as to advocate establishing a military relationship with South Africa, including use of the naval base at Simonstown by the United States Navy and strengthening the South Africa armed forces. (New York Times, June 13, 1980)

Mondale

"Our job in Nigeria's new democracy underscores the fundamental change in America's relations with Africa. When President Carter and I were inaugurated in early 1977, we were determined to build a new foreign policy on the foundation of America's democratic values.

We value justice. And so we committed our nation to an Africa free from racism and oppression.

We value personal dignity. And so we committed our nation to an Africa free from want and suffering.

We value peace. And so we committed our nation to an Africa free from war and from foreign domination.

These three goals -- human rights, economic progress, and peace -- were underlined by President Carter here in Lagos two years ago, in the first state visit by any American President to Africa. And when he arrived here, he was greeted by words both friendly and direct. "The Nigerian public" he was told, "has learned to measure policy pronouncements by results -- and not expectations."

It was an appropriate point. And tonight is an appropriate moment to assess those results -- and to survey the work ahead.

First, human rights. For the United States, the question is not whether we should work to advance justice in Africa, but rather how to do so.

Tonight, as your Vice President pointed out, we celebrate a historic step forward -- majority rule and independence for the people of Zimbabwe. It was an achievement of which Nigeria can be proud, most African governments, the British government, and all Zimbabweans should be proud. And I am proud that my own country stood firm with yours and others. For today, the people of Zimbabwe control their own future, free from outside interference, whether from their neighbors or from other continents.

Throughout the years of effort to find a solution, the United States held to a policy of support for free and fair elections, open to all parties; for a democratic and fair constitution; and for a negotiated settlement based on these principles.

The President insisted on maintaining American sanctions against Rhodesia until an impartial election process had begun. There was intense pressure to abandon this course -- to drop our principles and take a short-sighted view of our interests. But our President, he and our Congress, helped by the three great leaders, refused.

We know that it is in our national interest to support further programs for Zimbabwe. The United States has pledged substantial assistance to Zimbabwe -- because we believe that its future will help decide the future of southern Africa.

One of our partners in the search for peace in Zimbabwe was Sir Seretse Khama of Botswana. He was a gifted, gentle leader of modern Africa -- the father of a state both non-racial and democratic, in a turbulent region that has known too little of either quality and we all mourn his passing.

But we also celebrate a cause he nurtured -- democratic government in Africa. We welcome the return of civilian rule in Nigeria, Ghana and Upper Volta, and the movement toward democracy in other nations in this region. We applaud the heightened emphasis on human rights in many African nations and in OAU councils. We offer our support for the future of Zimbabwe. But we must also address those areas where human rights are trampled.

Injustice based on racial discrimination is abhorrent to men and women everywhere. That is why the problems of southern Africa have been of special concern.

We believe that an agreement on a plan for peace and justice in Namibia, based on fair and open elections, is within reach. The plan proposed by the UN Secretary-General has received strong African support and the agreement of the Southwest African People's Organization. South Africa has accepted the plan -- but does not yet agree on how to carry it out.

Now is the time for South Africa to put its faith in the plan it has accepted. If it does not, if instead it insists on its own formulas and carries the conflict further afield into neighboring states -- the opportunity for peace could be lost, and the conflict will continue. We urge South Africa to build on the experience of Zimbabwe and to move forward -- not backward -- on the issue of Namibia, while there is still time.

Events within South Africa concern us as well. In May of 1977, I met in Vienna with the then Prime Minister Vorster. I impressed upon him, in the clearest terms, that relations between our two countries would depend upon progress toward full human rights and full political participation for all the people of his country. I expressed our strong hope that the South Africa government would meet soon with representative leaders from across South African society to determine that country's future.

I repeat that appeal again today -- for the clock is ticking in South Africa.

We advocate no simple formula. We know there is no simple answer. We see the need to solve a problem. And we believe that only blacks and whites, talking and reasoning together, can find its solution.

Address in Nigeria
July, 1980

HUMAN RIGHTS

Reagan

Reagan's attitude toward human rights stems from the belief that the United States confuses its friends and allies with the selective application of a human rights policy, making it that much easier for the Soviets to drive for world domination.

"While the Soviets arrogantly warn us to stay out of their way, we occupy ourselves by looking for human rights violations in those countries which have historically been our friends and allies."

Address to Chicago Council
on Foreign Relations
March 17, 1980

Latin America

Reagan's disregard for the basic precepts of human rights is obvious in the admiring way he speaks of Argentina after three years of rule by a military dictatorship. Reagan quoted an economic advisor to the junta.

"...in the process of bringing stability to a terrorized nation of 25 million, a small number (of people) were caught in the cross fire, among them a few innocents."

Radio Transcript
August, 1979

Bush

"You're not always choosing in the world between perfection and imperfection. In Pakistan, it is in the interest of the United States to have a Pakistan that will not be dominated by the Soviet Union. That is our interest. Now, if that means at least having some negotiation with General Zia, who is less than perfect in human rights -- fine. But what kind of government, if you don't do it, and if Pakistan falls, do you get? You get one less interested in human rights. And I point to Iran as a good example of what I'm saying. I point to Iran."

Bill Moyers' Journal
WNET/Thirteen
March 6, 1980

Bush

"We are up against a strong force -- the Soviets backing the Cubans. I'm concerned about our foreign policy that, along with human rights, has also to consider the strategic interests of the country. I fault Carter, because in his concern for human rights, he has sacrificed that."

Peoria, IL, Journal Star
November 6, 1979

Bush

"My argument with Jimmy Carter is that he lets human rights drive our strategic interests. Iran is a good example. Cuba is a good example" of a foreign policy "where we wake up and we find not only is there less human rights, but our strategic interests have been diminished."

"Yes, there were some human rights violations (in Iran). But look at today and the adherence to human rights, plus our strategic interests are totally bludgeoned and totally diminished."

Des Moines, IA, Register
November 14, 1979

Bush

"So, the reality is: (you) need to redefine your policies so you can have a concern about human rights but so you're going to keep in mind at the same time your strategic interests."

Los Angeles, CA, Times
December 31, 1979

Bush

"We face a threat, which is manageable, nevertheless a threat from the Soviet Union, which compels us to strengthen our alliances, strengthen our intelligence and to strengthen our strategic posture around the world by altering our human rights policy, not to pull away from human rights, but not to be naive in our application."

Le Mars, IA, Daily Sentinel
December 17, 1979

Bush

"We should not impose our standard of human rights on every country around the world. China is a good example. We must improve relations, but if we start dictating to them or cutting them off because of human rights, we will diminish our strategic interest."

Washington Post
January 27, 1980

Bush

"If you just try to change governments because you don't like their human rights, sometimes you wake up and you find no human rights at all. We have to recognize there are varying degrees of imperfections in the world."

Rockford, IL
Freeport, IL, Journal-Standard
January 30, 1980

Bush

"Certainly the difference between me and some others is that I see areas of gray, I don't think everything is pure and impure, and I think we have been hypocritically selective in our indignation of human rights, and have diminished our strategic interests in the process. That's what I believe."

Los Angeles, CA Times interview
with Robert Scheer
January 24, 1980

Bush

"I like the concept that recognizes our commitment to humanrights but also recognizes that we're not gonna remake the world in our image...And we're also got to recognize that strategic interests are very important."

Illinois interviews and speeches
Champaign, IL, News-Gazette
February 3, 1980

Bush

"Im for human rights. We're all for human rights. But when we turn our backs on our allies, the ones we promised to support...someday we'll wake up and find no human rights at all -- and no strategic interests."

Greater Miami Kiwanis Club
Miami, FL, Herald
February 1, 1980

Bush

"If we press our friends for change and change and change so much faster than their systems can take... sometimes we wake up with that friend gone from the scene replaced by something less good, something worse in terms in human rights, and something where our strategic interests have been totally diminished."

Florida meeting
Washington Post
February 23, 1980

Carter

"The ultimate aim of our foreign policy must be to preserve freedom for ourselves and to expand freedom for others. This is a matter both of national principle and of national interest. For we believe that free and open societies are not only better able to meet the rising expectations of their people; they are also better able to accommodate often conflicting internal pressures before popular frustrations explode in violent and radical directions.

We do not seek to impose our system or institutions on others. Rather, we seek to support, in practical and concrete ways, the efforts of other nations to build their own institutions in ways that will meet the irrepressible human drive for freedom and justice.

Human rights policy commands the strong support of our citizens, and of the Congress. The world climate increasingly favors human rights progress.

Despite new turbulence and conflict, the past year featured some encouraging positive developments. We cannot and should not claim credit for them. But it is clear that we are part of a growing movement. During 1979, we saw:

- The further strengthening of democratic practices in Spain and Portugal, with free elections in both countries;
- The disappearance of several of the world's most repressive regimes;
- The freeing of political prisoners in Asia, Africa, and Latin America;
- A return to democratic rule in several Latin American countries and widespread progress in reducing human rights violations in the region;
- The growing strength of international human rights institutions. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights held its first meeting. Preparations began for another conference to review compliance with the Helsinki accords, to be held in Madrid this November. The OAU took long strides toward establishing a human rights commission for Africa. UN bodies became increasingly active in their human rights efforts.

State of the Union Address
January, 1980

Mondale

"Above all -- above all, America's strength depends on American values. Every time we have a foreign policy that reflects Americans' beliefs, we strengthen this nation.

Last month I was in Nigeria -- the world's most powerful black nation, and the second largest source of American oil. A few years ago the Secretary of State under the Republicans was told he was not welcome in Nigeria because they did not stand up for the principle of human rights and majority rule.

But when I went to Nigeria I was welcomed -- because the United States has a President -- President Carter -- who in his first act in office said from here on out the United States is going to stand for human rights and majority rule all over this earth.

And now in Rhodesia we see the same developments -- a new democracy based on democratic institutions, and the Soviets suffering another reversal. Today our human rights policy is drawing the nations of Africa and the world together like a magnet and toward us.

The Republicans say that a strong nation is one that never apologizes to anyone. I say it's a nation whose leaders are not doing things for which we must apologize. That's the difference.

A foreign policy that reflects American values advances American interests.

When President Carter saw to it that we ratified the Panama Canal treaties, not only did we rid ourselves of the last vestiges of colonialism: we also strengthened our influence in Latin America. When the President normalized relations with China, he not only told one-fourth of the human race that they exist: he also established a powerful counterforce to Soviet aggression. And when the President denounced the persecution of Andrei Sakharov, he not only affirmed individual liberty: he also unmasked the Kremlin to other nations."

Democratic National Convention
Acceptance Speech
August, 1980

LATIN AMERICA

Cuba

Reagan has long held that Cuba is a mere proxy of the Soviet Union, and is behind most revolutionary movements in Africa, and Latin America.

"Despite the power the Soviet Union is able to exert over Castro, the Cuban dictator still fancies himself as a revolutionary leader who aids and inspires revolts in Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. The Russians aren't bothered by Castro's delusions of grandeur because much of his international interference fits nicely into their own foreign policy designs."

Jefferson City Missouri Post
October 26, 1979

Relaxing Relations With Cuba

In 1977, when the Administration was considering relaxing relations with Cuba, Reagan wrote:

"...(t)he U.S. decision on Cuban trade must rest on broader considerations. Our trade embargo of Cuba is a little like a long-running advertising campaign. Just as its full effects are being felt, the sponsor may get tired of it."

Jefferson City Missouri Post
October 26, 1979

Cuban Refugees

Reagan supported a "Berlin airlift -- massive and swift" to rescue those Cuban residents seeking political asylum from Castro. (Dallas Times Herald, April 10, 1980)

Panama

Reagan has been at the forefront of those opposed to the Panama Canal Treaties. As negotiations were underway, Reagan stated his strong objection to the proposed Treaty.

"As I talk to you tonight, negotiations with another dictator go forward, negotiations aimed at giving up our ownership of the Panama Canal Zone...The Canal Zone is not a colonial possession. It is not a long-term lease. It is sovereign U.S. territory, every bit the same as Alaska and all the states that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase. We should end those negotiations and tell the (Panamanian head of state): 'We bought it, we paid for it, we built it and we intend to keep it.'"

Los Angeles Times
August 12, 1977

During the 1980 campaign Reagan has raised the issue of abrogating the Treaties on several occasions.

"If there is any possibility of keeping the Panama Canal, believe me I would do it because I believe it was one of the great mistakes we have made so far."

Bangor News
January 18, 1980

Mexico

In his announcement address, Reagan proposed a "North American Accord" between the United States, Mexico and Canada.

"I would be willing to invite each of our neighbors to send a special representative to our government to sit in on high level planning sessions with us, as partners, mutually concerned about the future of our Continent."

Announcement of Candidacy
November 13, 1979

Bush

"The idea of blockading Cuba, which Ronald Reagan has proposed, risks nuclear war and would require the entire Atlantic fleet. It wasn't Cuba that invaded Afghanistan, it was Russia. The way to peace is to keep this country strong, not through reckless foreign policy."

Milford, CT
Washington Star
March 22, 1980

Bush

"Unlike Berlin we do not have any air rights to fly through a corridor safely into Cuba. In addition, these Cuban people have been granted visas by the Peruvian government....

"What we are talking about here is not a state of war, pending war, or even hostility. We are talking about an evacuation problem, a problem the United States should help to solve by financial assistance and transportation assistance, especially through the use of ships or aircraft from a neighboring country (sic), such as Haiti."

Philadelphia press conference
Philadelphia, PA, Inquirer
April 12, 1980

Bush

"The correct approach (to the Cuban 'crisis') was to exert quiet but intense pressure; to inform the Soviet leadership that there could be no progress on the wide array of issues important to both sides until we were satisfied that the combat troops had been removed."

Washington Post
October 18, 1979

Central America and the Caribbean

Q: How serious is the political instability in Central America and the Caribbean? What is the U.S. doing to stop Cuba in its efforts to transform the Caribbean into a red sea?

A. Central America and the Caribbean are passing through a period of unusual social and political turbulence, and the U.S. is playing an active and positive role. Cuba is not the cause of the problems in the area, but its subversive efforts are making peaceful and democratic solutions more difficult to attain. We have devoted our efforts to assist moderate and democratic leaders in the area deal more effectively with their nations' economic and social problems, and at the same time, we are working to counter Cuba's aggression by enhanced military and security exercises and by close consultations with like-minded nations.

Since 1977, the U.S. has more than doubled its aid to the Caribbean, and when Congress completes action on the present aid bill, we will have nearly quadrupled our economic aid to Central America. We have done this, despite extraordinary budget restraints, because we recognize that only by investing in the economic future of the area can we give people hope and deprive the Communists of targets of exploitation.

Moreover, we have encouraged increasing aid and activities by international institutions and by other countries as a way to multiply our own impact. We have worked with 30 other nations and 15 international institutions to provide additional economic aid through the Caribbean Group. As a result of these efforts, multilateral assistance has increased fourfold between 1976 and 1980, from \$110 million to more than \$400 million. We have also undertaken regular consultations with regional leaders on political and security matters.

In summary, the U.S. had done more than any previous administration to try to ensure that this turbulent period will lead to democratic and social justice in Central America and the Caribbean. While there have been some setbacks, there have also been many more signs of success, including free elections in St. Vincent, Antigua, St. Kitts, Dominica and Costa Rica. An important land reform has been enacted in El Salvador. Cuba has been racked by a number of serious political and economic setbacks, and there is no better proof of the failure of the Cuban model than the mass exodus from the island.

Progress Toward Administration Goals in
Latin America and the Caribbean

Q: What progress has been made toward the goals President Carter set for his policy in Latin America?

A: On Pan American day in 1977, President Carter enunciated a new approach toward Latin America and the Caribbean. It is an approach which recognizes and is attuned to the important changes which have transformed the nations of the hemisphere during the last two decades; it is an approach which is guided by the universal ideals of human rights, democracy and security and by a vision of what we want this hemisphere to become.

Rather than bind ourselves to a single, uniform slogan or policy we have adopted a flexible approach enabling us to respond to the diversity of the region, the growing prosperity and self-confidence of some nations, the worsening economic plight of others and rapid political and social change in some. This flexibility comes from the President's principle of recognizing the individuality and sovereignty of each nation.

The nations in the hemisphere are now confident that we will treat them on the basis of mutual respect, and that we will cooperate in meeting external threats. This is in response to the President's steadfast commitment to the principle of non-intervention and to our obligations in the Rio Treaty.

For too long, the US was associated with dictatorships which trampled on human rights and with the status quo even when that meant poverty, political repression, and social justice. President Carter has changed the way the people of Latin America and the Caribbean view the US; the US is now associated with human rights, democracy, and moderate peaceful social change. Because the US is now identified with the cause of human rights, our ability to influence developments in the region in a direction compatible with universal ideals has been enhanced.

The third principle of the Pan American speech is to cooperate on global economic issues affecting the well-being of all American states. The major countries in the hemisphere have experienced rapid economic growth in which the private sector is playing a vital role. Our Economic Assistance to the poorer countries in the Caribbean and Central America has more than doubled since 1977. The Administration has taken the lead in negotiating large new replenishments of funds for the Inter American Development Bank and the World Bank, the two largest sources of aid to the area. Trade agreements have been concluded with 12 countries; we have successfully negotiated new international commodity arrangements for sugar, tin, coffee and rubber, and a new International Common Fund. The Administration has taken the initiative in developing new collaborative arrangements with the nations of the hemisphere in the important area of science and technology.

The President also attained specific goals.

1. A new treaty arrangement with Panama has been achieved. The Canal is operating smoothly and efficiently. A potential conflict with the people of Panama has been removed and the security of the canal enhanced. A divisive issue of long-standing in our hemispheric relations has been resolved to the satisfaction of all.

2. Encourage respect for human rights. The American Convention on Human Rights, signed by the President in 1977 and pending in the Senate, has now been ratified by 13 states and is in force. The Inter-American Human Rights Commission of the OAS has become a respected and vigorous voice in support of human rights, completing five major reports in the last two years. Violations of the integrity of persons have substantially declined in a number of countries. Disappearances are down in Argentina from more than 500 in 1978 to less than 50 in 1979; and in Chile and Uruguay there have been none confirmed since 1978. Political prisoners have been released in substantial numbers, about 3,900 in Cuba and all those previously held in Paraguay. The use of torture has declined sharply. Human rights has become a subject of major international importance, and progress is evident in virtually every country in this hemisphere.

3. To stand with those countries committed to democratic government. The trend toward democracy is gaining strength. Ecuador and now Peru have returned to freely elected democratic governments. Brazil has maintained a steady course toward democracy. Uruguay will have national elections next year. Chile is presently considering a democratic constitution. The new nations in the Caribbean, with the exception of Grenada, remain vibrant models of democracy despite severe economic hardship. The only setback has come in Bolivia, but even in Bolivia, where military coups are a tradition, one is encouraged by the strong new force of democratic groups and by the international support these groups have received.

4. To promote trade and investment. Long-standing hostility to US investment has diminished. Total trade reached \$59 billion in 1979, an increase of more than 20 percent in one year alone. The US has signed 12 trade agreements, increased aid, negotiated a Common Fund, and established new arrangements in science and technology.

5. To consult regularly on multilateral issues. This Administration has demonstrated its respect for the nations of the region by consulting regularly at all levels on issues of major concern, and by seeking whenever feasible, multilateral approaches to problems.

6. The Administration has successfully advanced US interests in human rights and other matters in Cuba. All Americans held in Cuban jails for political reasons have returned home, and many other political prisoners, including Huber Matos, have been released and have left the island. In 1979, over 100,000 Cuban residents in the United States visited their relatives in Cuba conveying in a personal way the advantages of a free economic and political system. Castro's bid for leadership in the Third World has been severely compromised. Among other setbacks, Cuba failed to win a seat on the Security Council. The exodus of Cubans in 1980 exposed the world to the failures of the Soviet system. But Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union remains and tension with us continues. We have improved our monitoring of Cuban/Soviet activities and increased our military readiness in the Caribbean as a precautionary measure. We now have American diplomats in Cuba giving us direct access to the Cuban government and firsthand knowledge of conditions there.

7. To forge new relationships in the Caribbean Basin. The President has placed special emphasis on developing a more balanced and respectful relationship with Mexico by inviting President Lopez Portillo as the first state visitor and subsequently meeting with him regularly, by setting up a special Coordinator for US-Mexican Affairs with the purpose of ensuring that all government agencies grant US-Mexican Affairs the priority it deserves. Using this mechanism, the US and Mexico have concluded agreements on energy, border problems, science and technology, and many other issues. The Administration's attention to the Caribbean and Central America have resulted in dramatically increasing our aid to the region, on improving the numbers and quality of our personnel, on enhancing the security of the area, and on improving people-to-people ties. Our goals in this turbulent region are to work with those who want moderate, peaceful reform and democracy.

From 1968 to 1971, he was senior partner in a New York law firm.

Since 1971 Goldberg has practiced law in Washington. He has served on the President's Committee on Youth Employment, the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy, and the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. He is former Chairman of the President's Committee on Migratory Labor.

Goldberg is the author of "AFL-CIO: Labor United" (1956), "Defenses of Freedom" (1966), "Equal Justice: The Warren Era of the Supreme Court" (1972), and numerous articles.

Mississippi River Commission

Nomination of William E. Read To Be a Member. September 7, 1977

The President today announced that he will nominate Brig. Gen. William E. Read, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission. He would succeed Maj. Gen. Charles I. McGinnis, who is being reassigned.

Read was born May 17, 1927, in Charlotte, N.C. He has served in the U.S. Army since 1950. He holds a B.S. in military engineering from the U.S. Military Academy and an M.S. in civil engineering from the University of Illinois.

Read served in Vietnam in 1970 and 1971. In 1971 and 1972, he was district engineer for the Tulsa District of the Army Engineer Division. From 1972 to 1974, he was Director of Procurement and Production for Army Aviation Systems Command in St. Louis, Mo., and from 1974 to 1976 he was Deputy Commanding General of that command.

Since 1976 Read has been division engineer for the Army Engineer Division,

Missouri River. He holds the Legion of Merit with Oak Leaf Cluster and the Bronze Star with two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Meeting With President Carlos Andrés Pérez of Venezuela

Remarks to Reporters Following the Meeting. September 7, 1977

President Pérez has developed into one of my best personal friends and is a great counselor and adviser for me on matters that concern the nations of the Caribbean and Central and South America.

Also, he was of great assistance in the negotiations between ourselves and Panama in developing the terms of the treaty.

The people of our country look upon President Pérez as a great leader in this hemisphere and also, of course, the leader of one of the great democracies of the world.

NOTE: The President spoke at 5:10 p.m. on the South Grounds of the White House. His concluding remarks in Spanish were not included in the transcript.

The transcript of the remarks was made available by the White House Press Office. It was not issued in the form of a White House press release.

Panama Canal Treaties

Remarks at the Signing Ceremony at the Pan American Union Building. September 7, 1977

Mr. Secretary General and distinguished leaders from throughout our own country and from throughout this hemisphere:

First of all, I want to express my deep thanks to the leaders who have come here from 27 nations in our own hemisphere, 20 heads of state, for this historic occasion.

I'm proud to be here as part of the largest group of heads of state ever assembled in the Hall of the Americas, Mr. Secretary General.

We are here to participate in the signing of treaties which will assure a peaceful and prosperous and secure future for an international waterway of great importance to us all.

But the treaties do more than that. They mark the commitment of the United States to the belief that fairness, and not force, should lie at the heart of our dealings with the nations of the world.

If any agreement between two nations is to last, it must serve the best interests of both nations. The new treaties do that. And by guaranteeing the neutrality of the Panama Canal, the treaties also serve the best interests of every nation that uses the canal.

This agreement thus forms a new partnership to insure that this vital waterway, so important to all of us, will continue to be well operated, safe, and open to shipping by all nations, now and in the future.

Under these accords, Panama will play an increasingly important role in the operation and defense of the canal during the next 23 years. And after that, the United States will still be able to counter any threat to the canal's neutrality and openness for use.

The members of the Organization of American States and all the members of the United Nations will have a chance to subscribe to the permanent neutrality of the canal.

The accords also give Panama an important economic stake in the continued, safe, and efficient operation of the canal and make Panama a strong and interested party in the future success of the waterway.

In the spirit of reciprocity suggested by the leaders at the Bogotá summit, the United States and Panama have agreed that any future sea-level canal will be built in Panama and with the cooperation of the United States. In this manner, the best interests of both our nations are linked and preserved into the future.

Many of you seated at this table have made known for years through the Organization of American States and through your own personal expressions of concern to my predecessors in the White House, your own strong feelings about the Panama Canal Treaty of 1903. That treaty, drafted in a world so different from ours today, has become an obstacle to better relations with Latin America.

I thank each of you for the support and help that you and your countries have given during the long process of negotiation, which is now drawing to a close.

This agreement has been negotiated over a period of 14 years under four Presidents of the United States.

I'm proud to see President Ford here with us tonight. And I'm also glad to see Mrs. Lyndon Johnson here with us tonight.

Many Secretaries of State have been involved in the negotiations. Dean Rusk can't be here. He has endorsed the treaty. But Secretary of State William Rogers is here. We are glad to have you, sir. And Secretary of State Henry Kissinger is here too.

This has been a bipartisan effort, and it is extremely important for our country to stay unified in our commitment to the fairness, the symbol of equality, the mutual respect, the preservation of the security and defense of our own Nation, and an exhibition of cooperation which sets a symbol that is important to us all before this assembly tonight and before the American people in the future.

This opens a new chapter in our relations with all nations of this hemisphere, and it testifies to the maturity and the good judgment and the decency of our people. This agreement is a symbol for the world of the mutual respect and cooperation among all our nations.

Thank you very much for your help.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:35 p.m. in the Hall of the Americas at the headquarters of the Organization of American States. In his opening remarks, he referred to Alejandro Orfila, OAS Secretary General.

Following the President's remarks, General Torrijos of Panama spoke, and then the two leaders signed the Panama Canal Treaty and the Treaty Concerning the Permanent Neutrality and Operation of the Panama Canal.

Panama Canal Treaties

Remarks at a White House Dinner for Western Hemisphere Leaders Attending the Signing Ceremony, September 7, 1977

We are not going to have toasts tonight, but I would like to say a few words of welcome to all of you.

I would like to start with one of the best friends I have, and a great leader of our country, President Ford, and welcome him here this evening.

And someone else who has inspired our country, and who has set an example of leadership and beauty and gracious example for us, and who also recognized the Marine Strings from olden times—Lady Bird Johnson.

I know that most of you were at the ceremonies where the treaties were signed, so I won't try to introduce all our guests, but I would like to present to you again our special guest for this evening, General Torrijos from Panama and his wife, Mrs. Torrijos.

Some guests that General Torrijos cares much more about now than he does about

me are the Members of the United States Senate. [Laughter] We are glad to have all of you here. It's a very fine thing for you to come.

I think that this was a very fine night, too, in the life of the Organization of American States. Secretary General Orfila, we are very proud to have you here.

Mr. Ellsworth Bunker and Sol Linowitz, would you stand just a moment? General Torrijos said he's going to be very lonesome in Panama in the future without Ambassador Bunker being there. [Laughter] He's been negotiating in Panama now for 14 years. And this is a great accomplishment for our country and also for Panama.

We invited a special guest from Brazil here tonight, Pele, but at the last minute he had to leave to go to Spain.

I was talking to General Torrijos. As you may know, the lightweight boxing champion of the world is Señor Durran from Panama, and he's very hard to match, but we tried to match him by the heavyweight champion of the world, Muhammad Ali, and we are very glad to have you here.

There's another man that I would like to introduce—he and his wife. I've been a very close reader of the sports page for the last several weeks, because we have a very distinguished Georgian who has, I think, come forward with a great deal of enthusiasm and skill, a great deal of understanding of the elements, the ocean in particular. He's exemplified, I think the name of his boat. He's a very courageous man—Ted Turner. We are very proud to have you here tonight. And as you all know, he will represent us in the America's Cup races very shortly, having overwhelmed his opponents much better

than has been the case with his baseball team, the Atlanta Braves. [Laughter]

This is an evening of historic importance, and I invited another special guest from Georgia, a woman whose husband inspired the world, Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.

I was talking to General Torrijos a few moments ago about how important the treaty was to Panama. It was shown throughout Latin America for a full hour live this evening—the ceremonies. And he said that because of the demands of his own people, that he used helicopters to carry to all the remote villages in Panama television sets; and since they didn't have electricity, that he also carried small electric generators so that he wouldn't have to carry all the people from the remote areas into Panama City this evening. And I think this demonstrates the importance of the treaty to Panama.

He said, "Mr. President, I can tell you without fear of being wrong that more than a million Panamanians wept this evening during the ceremonies."

And I could tell from his own private conversations with me the tremendous importance of this long search for an equitable treaty that has been consummated this evening.

There is another special difference between this treaty and the one that was signed in 1903. The Panamanians had a chance to read it before it was signed—[laughter]—which was not the case with the first treaty. And I believe that the American people are big enough and strong enough, courageous enough and understanding enough to be proud of what has been accomplished, initiated by President Johnson in 1963, following a temporary outbreak of violence in the Panama Canal Zone. And the demonstration that President Johnson gave of our good intentions caused an equal demon-

stration of patience and perseverance and good faith and good manners on the part of the Panamanians.

And the negotiations continued under President Nixon and under President Ford. And I am very glad that my predecessors, their Secretaries of State, their Vice Presidents and negotiators have led up to this successful conclusion of the effort this day.

We have an opportunity now in our own country to demonstrate again the respect and the appreciation which we feel toward our neighbors in the southern part of this hemisphere. This has not always been apparent to our neighbors, but I think the American people feel this deep within them, that the most precious friendships, the staunchest historical supporters, and those with whom we share a common history and a common future are those who live in Canada and in the nations to the south. And I believe that this treaty can open up a new era of understanding and comprehension, friendship and mutual respect, throughout not only this hemisphere but throughout the world.

It's not an easy thing to accept a change which has been so profoundly balanced in our favor and which can now be of equal benefit to both countries. But ours is a great country, and it's great enough to be fair.

I think it's accurate to say that never in the last 14 years has there been any semblance of a threat or an expression of displeasure on the part of the Panamanians toward our negotiators. Ambassador Bunker has told me this more than once.

And President Torrijos, I thank you for the good will that has been brought by you for the last 9 years as President and leader of your country to the negotiating table. And many other leaders who are represented here—27 countries in our

hemisphere—have contributed a great deal of support and advice in times when the negotiations seemed to be on the verge of being broken off, when they gave quiet demonstrations of their interest in the treaty and what it might mean to all of us.

So, I am grateful to all of you leaders for coming here to give our people an expression of your interest and your support. And I think I can assure you that our Nation will rally itself to ratify the treaty, and also, General Torrijos feels sure that when the facts are presented to the Panamanians that in the plebiscite that will be held late in October, that his people will also give their approval to this great step forward toward peace and mutual respect.

We will have a chance during this 3 or 4 days—I will, and my Cabinet members—to meet with all of you leaders who have come from your own great countries. And I think that you are taking advantage of this opportunity to meet with one another to resolve longstanding disputes, to work out means of alleviating the threat of possible arms races that might lead to war or to conflict of some kind, and to restore friendships that perhaps in the past have been damaged and to join with one another in planning for the future, economically and politically, that will give us all a better life.

So, I believe that we'll always look back upon this event that has been made possible by General Torrijos and many of you as the first step toward even greater progress and greater friendship in what I think is the greatest hemisphere on Earth, the Western Hemisphere of our world.

Thank you very much.

I should have paused for the translations, but I didn't, and we will ask the translator to take his place now. And fol-

lowing that we will go and have a brief cup of coffee, and then I think you will hear some of the most delightful entertainment that you've ever heard.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 p.m. in the State Dining Room at the White House.

United States-Canada Agreement on a Natural Gas Pipeline

*Joint Statement by the President and
Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau.
September 8, 1977*

Today, we have agreed in principle on the elements of a joint proposal to construct the Alcan-Foothills pipeline along the Alaska Highway to transport Alaskan natural gas through Canada to the lower 48 States and at a later time Canadian gas to Canadian markets.

This joint undertaking will be the largest single private energy project in history. The detailed agreement we hope to sign next week is an example of how both countries can work together to meet their energy needs.

After the agreement is signed, each of us intends to submit our decisions to our respective legislative bodies for the appropriate authorizations and assurances. We are both hopeful the project will be approved.

Major benefits from this project will accrue to both countries. When the pipeline is built, Canada will have a much greater ability to develop its own gas reserves, particularly in the frontier region of the Mackenzie Delta.

The U.S., in turn, will have the enormous benefit of new natural gas supplies.

Mondale

"President Royo, Mrs. Royo, distinguished heads of delegations, members of Congress, honored guests and friends. This is indeed a proud day for the people of Panama. And it is a proud day for the people of the United States. Together on this moving occasion, our two nations rejoice as we write a new chapter in the history of our hemisphere. We meet at the magnificent Canal of Panama. For 65 years it has stood as a triumphant symbol of civilization, of the engineering, medical, and entrepreneurial genius of the 20th century. But from this moment forward the Panama Canal takes on a second symbolic meaning. It becomes two success stories; both of technology and of political ideals; both of engineering wizardry and of diplomatic vision; both of the conquest of nature and the cooperation of cultures. We now seal a relationship between two independent nations to guarantee the operation and defense of one of the world's key waterways, working together in mutual interest and for mutual benefit. The United States and Panama can be confident in our ability to achieve our shared objectives. I am here today to say that we will honor in full the terms of the Treaty. We will keep the Canal operating smoothly just as it has been since its opening in 1914. It will remain a safe and sure route of transit for the commerce of the entire world. Today the United States and Panama settle more than the future of the Canal. For as President Carter has said these treaties mark the commitment of the United States to the belief that fairness and not force should lie at the heart of our dealings with the nations of the world. Our partnership is the outcome not of the politics of confrontation but of a common search for justice. A politics not of domination or dependence but of mutual interest and aspiration. And other countries of the world near and far can draw a meaning of what Panama and the United States have accomplished. For both our countries have acted with restraint and responsibility. Both achieved long-standing goals, and both have strengthened their capacity for independent action and influence on the global scene. Panama has long been a crossroads of world commerce. Today Panama also stands at the midpoint of a new heartland of emerging democracy. In Quito, in La Paz, we have just witnessed free elections and a successful transition to civilian rule. In Lima a new constitution has been adopted. In Santo Domingo elections brought an orderly transfer of power for the first time in our century. In Managua winds of democratic progress are stirring where they have long been stifled. In Honduras, the return to constitutional rule and elections is underway. From the Dominican Republic to the North, from the Andean states to the South we celebrate today a remarkable advance toward effective democratic institutions. This move toward more open and democratic societies is an indigenous process, not a formula imposed from elsewhere without regard to the diversities of the people concerned.

It is a dynamic and evolving order reflecting national diversities alive to aspirations for human rights, and responsive to the drive to participate in the political process. The process of the past two years refutes the claim that only authoritarian methods can provide the social discipline for wellbeing and growth. Instead, as the Quito declaration states, the best way to guarantee the prosperity of people is to provide a climate of freedom and enforcement of human rights under new forms of social democracy. These are the ideals we enshrine in our Panama Canal treaties.

As 15 years of negotiations reach their moment of fulfillment today, let us pay tribute to the countless thousands who have made and still make the Canal great. To the French pioneers who launched its history, to the Americans, and Barbadians, and Jamaicans, and people literally from every nation in the world who built the Canal against such overwhelming odds. To the Panamanians and Americans whose hard work day after day has maintained its efficient operation and to those who will continue that crucial work by staying on with the Panama Canal Commission. The creation of the Canal, as its superb historian has written, "was one of the supreme human achievements of all time, the culmination of a heroic dream of four hundred years, and of more than 20 years of phenomenal effort and sacrifice. The fifty miles between the oceans were among the hardest ever won by human effort and ingenuity. And no statistics on tonnage or tolls can begin to convey the grandeur of what was accomplished. The Canal is an expression of that old and noble desire, to bridge the divide, to bring people together." So today let us celebrate a new bridging of the divide, a new drawing together. For 65 years the Panama Canal has joined the oceans. Now and forevermore it will join our ideals.

Thank you."

Press Release
Albrook Field, Panama
October 1, 1979

MAY 14, 1980

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

WHITE HOUSE STATEMENT ON
CUBAN REFUGEES

After consultations with senior advisers and with Congress, and in the spirit of the San Jose Conference, the President has decided to take the following steps to welcome the Cuban refugees in a legal and orderly process:

1. We are prepared to start an airlift or a sealift immediately as soon as President Castro accepts this offer. Our Government is chartering two large, sea-worthy ships, which will go to Key West to standby, ready to go to Cuba. To ensure a legal and orderly process, all people will have to be screened before departure from Cuba. Priority will be given to political prisoners, to close relatives of U.S. permanent residents, and to persons who sought freedom in the Peruvian Embassy and in our Interest Section last month. In the course of our discussions with the Congress and with the Cuban-American community, the international community and the Cuban Government, we will determine the number of people to be taken over the next twelve months. We will fulfill our humanitarian responsibilities, and we hope other governments will adjust their previous pledges to resettle Cuban refugees to take into account the larger problem that has developed. This will provide a safe and orderly way to accommodate Cubans wishing to enter the U.S.
2. Tomorrow, we will open a Family Registration Office in Miami to receive the names of close Cuban relatives of U.S. permanent residents who will be eligible for immigration.
3. The Coast Guard is now communicating with these vessels illegally enroute to or from Cuba and those already in Mariel Harbor to tell them to return to the United States without taking Cubans on board. If they follow this directive, they have nothing to fear from the law. We will do everything possible to stop these illegal trips to Cuba. We will take the following steps to ensure that the law is obeyed:
 - (a) The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) will continue to issue notices of intent to fine those unlawfully bringing Cubans to this country. As fines become due, they will be collected.
 - (b) All vessels currently and unlawfully carrying Cubans to this country will henceforth be seized by the Customs Service.
 - (c) Anyone who tampers with or seeks to move a ship to Cuba which has been seized will be subject to separate criminal prosecution.

MORE

- (d) The Coast Guard will continue to review each vessel that returns to the United States for violations of boat safety law. Those found to be in gross violation of the law will be subject to criminal prosecution and additional fines. Furthermore, boats which are found to be safety hazards will be detained.
 - (e) Any individual who has been notified by INS for unlawfully bringing Cubans into the country and who makes another trip will be subject to criminal prosecution and the boat used for such a repeat trip will be seized for forfeiture proceedings.
 - (f) Law enforcement agencies will take additional steps, as necessary, to implement this policy and to discourage the unlawful boat traffic to Cuba.
4. Castro has taken hardened criminals out of prison and mental patients out of hospitals and has forced boat owners to take them to the U.S. Thus far, over 400 such prisoners have been detained. We will not permit our country to be used as a dumping ground for criminals who represent a danger to our society, and we will begin exclusion proceedings against these people at once.
5. These steps will make clear to the Government of Cuba our determination to negotiate an orderly process. This is the mission of the three-government delegation established by the San Jose Conference last week. Our actions are intended to promote an international solution to this problem. We intend to continue our consultations with the participants of the San Jose Conference and consider additional steps the international community should take to resolve this problem.

In summary, the U.S. will welcome Cubans, seeking freedom, in accordance with our laws, and we will pursue every avenue to establish an orderly and regular flow.

The President continues to be greatly concerned about the Haitians who have been coming to this country on small boats. He has instructed appropriate federal agencies to receive the Haitians in the same manner as others seeking asylum. However, our laws never contemplated and do not provide adequately for people coming to our shores in the manner the Cubans and Haitians have. We will work closely with the Congress to formulate a long-term solution to this problem and to determine the legal status of these "boat people" after the current emergency situation is controlled.

The Cuban American community has contributed much to Miami, the State of Florida, and to our country. The President understands the deep desire to reunite families which has led to this situation. He calls upon the Cuban-American community to end the boat flotilla and help bring about a safe and orderly resolution to this crisis.

DEFENSE POLICY/WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Reagan

I. Weapon Systems

Reagan and the Republican Platform call for massive rearmament in both conventional and nuclear forces. While both Reagan and the Republican platform list specific weapon systems which they would fund, it appears that Reagan favors an arms race as an end in itself -- as a means for challenging Soviet industrial capacity:

"If we start an arms buildup, they (the Soviets) will understand that the alternative to legitimate limitation is our industrial might and power turned to a military buildup."

Wall Street Journal
June 3, 1980

Reagan has been a constant supporter of all weapon programs. In fact, he has never publicly opposed any major weapon system in the last 15 years.

Neutron Bomb

Reagan strongly opposed any funding cuts in the development of the neutron bomb. He views the neutron bomb as "an offensive weapon that could bridge the gap for conventional weapons." (New York Times, May 6, 1980)

Reagan has called the neutron bomb the closest thing to the ideal weapon.

"Very simply it is the dreamed of death ray weapon of science fiction. It kills enemy soldiers but doesn't blow up the surrounding countryside or destroy villages, towns and cities. It won't destroy an enemy tank -- just kill the tank crew.

"Now some express horror at this and charging immortality, portray those who would use such a weapon as placing a higher value on property than human life. This is sheer unadulterated nonsense. It is harsh sounding, but all war weapons back to club, the sling and the arrow, are designed to kill

the soldiers of the enemy. With gunpowder and artillery and later bombs and bombers, war could not be confined to the battlefield. And so came total war with non-combatants outnumbering soldiers in casualties."

Reagan Radio Transcript
March 1978 - April 1978

Reagan supports deployment of the neutron bomb in almost every available delivery system.

"I favor development and deployment of the neutron warhead for U.S. theatre nuclear forces, including ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, artillery and bombs."

Washington Post
April 24, 1980

MX Missile

Reagan supports development of the MX Missile system. However, because it will be years before the system is deployable, he has called for a faster remedy.

"To prevent the ultimate catastrophe of a massive nuclear attack, we urgently need a program to preserve and restore our strategic deterrent. The Administration proposes a costly and complex new missile system. But we can't complete that until the end of this decade. Given the rapidly growing vulnerability of our land based missile force, a faster remedy is needed."

Address to Chicago Council on
Foreign Relations
March 17, 1980

Cruise Missile

Reagan is a strong advocate of the cruise missile.

"You've got a weapon system they can't counter ...The cruise missile could be just that."

Los Angeles Times

Reagan has attacked the Carter Administration for delaying production of the cruise missile.

"We have an administration that in three years has done away with...the cruise missile...and you could go on with weapon after weapon..."

San Jose News
March 10, 1980

Republican Platform

The Republican platform calls for development of virtually every weapon system under consideration:

- o the earliest possible deployment of the MX missile in a prudent survivable configuration;
- o accelerated development and deployment of a new manned strategic penetrating bomber that will exploit the \$5.5 billion already invested in the B-1, while employing the most advanced technology available;
- o deployment of an air defense system comprised of dedicated modern interceptor aircraft and early warning support systems;
- o acceleration of development and deployment of strategic cruise missiles deployed on aircraft, on land, and on ships and submarines;
- o modernization of the military command and control system to assure the responsiveness of U.S. strategic nuclear forces to presidential command in peace or war; and
- o vigorous research and development of an effective anti-ballistic missile system, such as is already at hand in the Soviet Union, as well as more modern ABM technologies."

1980 Republican Platform

B-1 Bomber

In 1976, when the Senate voted to delay a decision on building the B-1 bomber, Reagan criticized its action.

"The action in the Senate must have been good news in Moscow. They must have been toasting in the Kremlin."

Washington Post
May 22, 1976

Similarly, when President Carter cancelled production of the B-1, Reagan questioned the decision.

"I don't think that the current administration is doing what should be done - not when it cancels the B-1 bomber, which is probably the foremost advance in aircraft that has ever been -- or has been presented since we went to the jet engines..."

Face the Nation
May 14, 1978

Y-C 14

Reagan criticized the Carter Administration for cutting funding for the Boeing YC-14:

"All of this sounds reassuring, doesn't it? But there is a kicker in the story - Last December the Administration cancelled the YC-14 program in one of its 'national security' or perhaps I should say 'insecurity' decisions.

"Meanwhile, by some strange coincidence the Soviet Union just happens to be going full-speed ahead on an airplane building program. And the plane they are building looks for all the world like a mirror image of the YC-14. Well, why not? The YC-14 is the most advanced idea in cargo transport of combat forces and equipment in the world today."

Reagan Radio Broadcast
June, 1978

MILITARY POLICY

Bush

"My view is, get a good SALT Treaty and sign it. My view is, strengthen defense. So I think the linkage that I got from your question is though I know others feel that way, I think it is; and my view has always been judge the Treaty on its merits, and if it's good, go ahead. Strengthen defense; yes, we're going to have to do that. You see, when President Carter came in he took out of the Ford budget the B-1, the neutron, improvement of the Navy. And there was one other major area -- MX -- the mobile missile. And he took all this out, shifted that money over into the social side of the equation, in terms of spending, and I think those priorities were wrong. I think we're getting too weak."

CBS Face the Nation
page 8
October 7, 1979

Bush

"For even if the Carter administration were able to convince the American people that it hasn't failed in its responsibility to maintain our nation's strategic capabilities -- and I, for one, believe the people are wise enough to see through this orchestrated campaign -- the Soviet Union is all-too-aware of our country's diminished military, naval and strategic power.

"The men in the Kremlin know, as Governor Reagan has pointed out, that in the past fifteen years the United States has lost its deterrent advantage over the Soviet Union in all but a handful of military categories -- and if current trends continue, they'll surpass us even in those.

"It's a frightening thought. But in this crucial year of decision, the operative phrase in that thought is, obviously, "if current trends continue."

World Affairs Council, Pittsburgh
September 5, 1980

Carter Record on Defense Programs:
Claims and Reality

The Administration's defense budgets and programs demonstrate its clear commitment to preserving our national security in the face of sustained Soviet challenge. This record stands in clear contrast to the performance--if not the rhetoric--of preceding Republican administrations.

Some have claimed that "Ford would have done more than President Carter has done." It is always easier to claim what might have been done than to actually deliver. Again, the President's record is noteworthy--four years of sustained real growth, in contrast to eight years of real decline.

e The last "real" Ford budget was the one for Fiscal Year 1977, submitted in 1976; before GOP primaries stimulated a series of interim changes, and before the President's defeat in November 1976 left his officials just before leaving office free to propose a budget that did not have to meet the standards of realism and consistency required of a budget that must be defended and executed by its authors.

e Claims that strategic programs planned by the Ford Administration were vitiated by President Carter are based on a combination of misleading assertions and oversimplification. These charges simply don't stand up under scrutiny.

-- We already had 100 "extra" Minuteman missiles (missiles without launchers) in the inventory. Keeping the production line in a stand-by status (as suggested by Ford) at a cost of as much as \$300 million a year, made no sense at all, and this Administration wisely declined to do it.

-- Ford's covered trench-mobile MX missile might have been operational in FY 84, as he projected, but the system as designed would have been much less capable than the carefully studied design now undergoing full scale development by the Carter Administration.

-- Meeting a FY 79 IOC for the TRIDENT SSBN, as projected by the Republicans, was clearly impossible as early as 1975. Shipyard management and industrial delay problems which plagued the TRIDENT program under previous administrations have now been cleared up. The first TRIDENT submarine is at sea now and will be on patrol next year.

-- The B-1 would not be as effective a way to maintain the third leg of our deterrent--in the face of vigorous Soviet air defense programs--as would the Administration's dynamic program of ALCM development, production and deployment. The ALCM contractor has been recently selected, and the program is on schedule. Work on design, construction and eventual procurement of a new ALCM carrier aircraft is also underway and on schedule. We now project an 1982 IOC for the first full squadron of B-52s, each aircraft equipped with 16 missiles. (Funding has also been requested for new penetrating bomber technology for a 1990s replacement to the B-52.)

-- Finally, the Carter Administration has assigned high priority to realistic ground- and sea-launched cruise missile programs, with the result that we will have a GLCM available for deployment in Europe as soon as the infrastructure is available to receive it. In December our NATO allies endorsed this deployment as one element of the Alliance's TNF modernization program. A SLCM program is proceeding in parallel with the counterpart ground-launched project. By contrast, no decisions on full-scale development of any cruise missile were made by the Republicans until the last few days of the Ford Administration.

• This Administration has responded wisely to the adverse trends in the military balance (trends which arise from a doubling of Soviet military spending in the last twenty years while ours remained level) and to increased dangers to U.S. interests through steady increases in defense budgets, culminating in substantial growth in the FY 81 defense budget. Our current Five Year Defense Program projects continued real growth in defense spending through FY 1985.

In the first year of this Administration, we placed the major weight of our efforts behind improving NATO's early conventional combat capability, primarily through the Alliance's Long Term Defense Program and the three percent real growth commitment. We next turned to the problem of modernizing our strategic Triad. Most recently, we have taken steps to modernize our theater nuclear forces in Europe. Thus, programs in each of these areas are underway and have momentum. We are now concentrating special attention and resources on improving our capabilities to deal with the threats and crises around the world and, in particular, we are acting to expand the improvement (begun two years ago) in our ability to get men and equipment quickly to potential areas of conflict and to retain our preeminence at sea in an era of new technologies.

Not only has the President's commitment to growth in Defense capability been steady over three years, but key planning to meet contingencies such as the present crisis in the Persian Gulf has been underway for some two years. Critics have tried to claim that our healthy increase in 1981 Defense spending was a last minute concoction in response to Afghanistan, and that our Rapid Deployment Forces were likewise an eleventh hour invention.

The contrary is true, and we have the public record to prove it. Our 1981 program was built last summer, with important emphasis--pre-hostage and pre-Afghanistan--on expanded capabilities to deploy forces worldwide, outside the NATO theater. That program and the emphasis was formulated during the early fall of 1971 and briefed to the Congress by Secretary Brown in early December, before the Soviet invasion into Afghanistan. While some members in the Congress (which has cut every Carter defense budget by \$1B or more) have only recently "recognized" the need for sustained real growth, President Carter has been requesting and urging support for such defense budgets since his inauguration.

The Carter modernization thrust spans the entire defense program, with impressive capabilities now and in the future:

- For the Army, more than doubling the prepositioned combat equipment in NATO to allow rapid reinforcement of our Allies, the new XM-1 tank, IFV armored vehicle, and the Roland air defense missile.

- For the Navy and Marines, the Trident missile and continued Trident submarine production, the AEGIS fleet air defense cruiser, new TAKX Marine Maritime Prepositioning ships, the F-18/A-18 fighter and attack aircraft, and more FFG-7 frigates for protection of supply convoys.

- For the Air Force, the MX missile and the air-launched cruise missile (a far more capable alternative to the B-1) to modernize and strengthen our strategic capability; twenty-six fully equipped tactical fighter wings, many with new F-15, F-16 and A-10 aircraft; the KC-10 advanced cargo/tanker aircraft to speed rapid deployment; and the CX transport aircraft to expand our ability to airlift men and equipment anywhere on the globe.

In addition, we are strengthening our nation's ability to respond forcefully in a crisis by reinstituting registration for potential military service. This registration of

young men shortens the time it will take us to mobilize in the face of any military contingency, and it will tend to increase enlistments, especially in our reserve forces.

In sum, the record of President Carter is a measured, responsible performance that reflects his consistent, long-term commitment to our nation's security.

AN OVERVIEW OF MAJOR DEFENSE PROGRAMS

This paper presents a brief overview of the major defense programs in the Carter Administration's Five Year Defense Program.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS

A. Strategic Forces

1. MX - In order to meet the challenge posed by the vigorous Soviet ICBM program, we will deploy 200 new MX inter-continental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) in a mobile and survivable basing mode. Each MX will be equipped with 10 warheads, compared to three on each of our current MINUTEMAN III missiles.

2. TRIDENT - We are modernizing the sea-based leg of the strategic TRIAD with two major programs. The new highly-accurate TRIDENT I missile will be placed on POSEIDON submarines. This missile's longer range will enable submarines equipped with it to patrol an ocean area 10 times larger, thus making them more difficult for the Soviets to detect and destroy. The new TRIDENT submarine, the first of which is scheduled to go on patrol next year, has more (24) and larger missile tubes than the POSEIDON boats, is quieter, and can remain on patrol much longer.

3. Air-Launched Cruised Missile - The long-range, deadly-accurate air-launched cruise missile (ALCM) is the key to the modernization of the third leg of the TRIAD, our bomber force. Our plans are to deploy over 3,000 ALCMs on 151 of our B-52 bombers. The ALCM can be launched from a bomber that is far outside the range of Soviet air defenses. This program will provide an effective retaliatory force well into the 1980s and beyond.

4. New Strategic Aircraft - To hedge against unexpected vulnerabilities in the B-52/ALCM system, we are continuing to investigate designs for a new cruise missile carrier and a new manned penetrating bomber.

B. Forces for NATO

1. NATO Long Term Defense Program (LTDP) - This Administration has reaffirmed our historic commitment to the defense of Western Europe against the Warsaw Pact. In 1978, NATO adopted the LTDP (proposed by the United States in 1977), which provides for long-term planning and co-operative efforts among the United States and our NATO allies. We and our NATO allies are committed to increasing real defense spending (after inflation) by three percent per year through the mid-1980s, in order to bolster our conventional capabilities to deter -- and, if necessary, to defeat -- Warsaw Pact aggression.

2. Theater Nuclear Forces - Theater nuclear forces (TNF) provide an important link between conventional and strategic nuclear capabilities, demonstrating our willingness to use nuclear weapons, if necessary, in support of our NATO allies. The Soviet build-up in their own long-range theater nuclear forces (especially the BACKFIRE bomber and the SS-20 missile) cannot go unanswered by NATO. Thus, modernization of our long-range TNF is a top priority. In December 1979, the Alliance decided to deploy in Europe 464 ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs) beginning in 1983 and replace 108 of our older PERSHING IA missiles with longer-range PERSHING II missiles.

3. Pre-positioned Equipment - Our NATO reinforcement objectives can be met only if we severely reduce the demand on our limited airlift assets during the early stages of a conflict. To accomplish this, we are going to preposition more equipment in Europe. We have programmed enough additional equipment for three divisions in Europe by 1982 and are considering further increases.

4. Readiness and Sustainability - In order to increase both the readiness of our forces in Europe as well as their ability to fight for longer periods of time, we are programming increases in spare parts, munitions, support structure and training, war reserves, and other key support items. In the FY 1981 budget request, 63 percent of the \$59 billion defense logistics dollars are dedicated to support peacetime material readiness programs.

C. Mobility Forces

Our long-term mobility objective is to be able to support the concurrent demands of a world-wide NATO-Warsaw Pact conflict and those of a non-NATO contingency. We will meet those demands with a carefully balanced program of forward deployed forces, airlift, sealift and prepositioned equipment.

1. Airlift - We are moving ahead with plans for the CX transport, which will carry outsized cargo (such as heavy tanks) over intercontinental ranges and have the capability to operate into small, austere airfields. We are considering two alternatives for the CX: a totally new aircraft and an existing aircraft (or modified version), like the C-5 or 747. To support deployment of our general purpose forces, we have programmed a new tanker-cargo aircraft, the KC-10. The KC-10 will have a unique long-range, large off-load capacity and the ability to carry cargo in addition to fuel. We are also enhancing our Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) program, under which commercial aircraft are converted to carry military passengers or cargo during a crisis.

2. Sealift - Even with enhanced airlift to augment our sealift capability, much of the equipment our troops will need in combat must be carried by ship. We are purchasing eight commercial SL-7 cargo ships and converting them to RO/RO (Roll-on/Roll-off) ships. These fast ships can carry large amounts of equipment to European seaports in four days, and the Persian Gulf in two weeks, from U.S. ports on the East coast.

3. Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force (RDJTF) - In order to be able to respond rapidly to the requirements of a non-NATO contingency, we have designated certain of our land, sea, and air forces for the RDJTF. The forces available to the RDF include both heavy and light Army and Marine units, naval carrier battle groups, and tactical fighter and airlift wings. In a non-NATO contingency, we would initially deploy our light ground forces and tactical aircraft, with emphasis on speed and mobility, followed by heavy armored RDF forces, as dictated by the requirements of the particular contingency.

4. Maritime Prepositioning - Since rapidly deployable light forces are not adequate for sustained combat, we also need a capability to deploy heavy armored forces rapidly. A major initiative to that end is our program to buy new Maritime Prepositioning Ships (MPS). By prepositioning equipment, supplies and ammunition, these new ships will enable us to rapidly deploy an armor-heavy Marine division anywhere in the world. In the interim, we are currently prepositioning equipment for certain Marine units on seven specially configured commercial ships, which are now en route to the Indian Ocean to provide a flexible and rapid response capability for non-NATO contingencies.

D. Other Modernization Programs

1. Tactical Air - We are completing a major modernization of our tactical air (TACAIR) forces. Air Force units are now being equipped with the F-15, the world's best fighter; the highly reliable F-16 multi-purpose fighter; and the A-10, close air support and interdiction aircraft. Navy TACAIR units are now flying the F-14, which, with its sophisticated PHOENIX missile system, provides a significant air defense capability. We are also programming a new F/A-18 multi-purpose fighter/attack aircraft. To complement our TACAIR systems, we are also continuing to buy one more example of U.S. state-of-the-art military technology, the Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft, which provides early detection, warning, and command and control for our TACAIR forces.

2. XM-1 - The XM-1 main battle tank will provide a significant improvement in our ability to counter the Warsaw Pact armored threat. The XM-1 now carries a 105mm gun which can be fired accurately, day or night, even while the tank is moving at speeds up to 40 mph. In 1984, we will arm the MX-1 with a new, German-designed 120mm gun, which will insure its ability to counter the enemy threat into the 1990s.

3. Naval Forces - We are modernizing our naval forces both by building new ships and by updating existing ones. Our current plans call for expanding our fleet to a full 550 ships. We will maintain our force of 12 operating aircraft carriers through the year 2000 by continuing the Service Life Extension Program (SLEP). We are maintaining the best anti-submarine warfare (ASW) capability in the world by procuring new attack submarines and frigates, and improving surveillance, detection and other ASW related equipment. We are continuing to build the AEGIS air defense ships which allow our naval forces to operate in "high-threat" areas. With its phased-array radar and automated control systems, AEGIS will substantially increase our capability to protect carrier battle groups against heavy air-to-surface missile attacks. Our ability to conduct amphibious operations will be enhanced by our program to buy new LSD-41 amphibious ships and TAKX maritime prepositioning ships. Our FY 1981 program calls for procurement of a total of 97 new ships, including guided missile frigates, oilers, mine countermeasure ships and cargo ships. These programs fully exploit the technological lead the U.S. holds in naval force development. The vast capabilities of U.S. naval power cannot be measured in terms of numbers alone. Our technological superiority has kept our Navy "second to none."

E. People Programs

Ensuring that we have capable and motivated people for our military forces is one of our top priority defense objectives. While we have placed greater emphasis on improving our recruiting programs, we have found that increased retention of senior enlisted men and women as well as officers in certain critical skills is essential.

To help meet the needs of our servicemen and women, President Carter has supported an 11.7 percent pay increase and proposed a comprehensive Fair Benefits Package, which includes:

- increased flight pay and sea pay;
- expanded reenlistment bonuses;

- a variable housing allowance for high-cost areas within the U.S.;
- higher reimbursement rates for travel required to assume a new assignment;
- family separation allowances for lower enlisted ranks;
- continuation bonus for pilots;
- a dental plan for dependents; and
- baby care for dependents under two years of age.

We are confident that enactment of this proposal will greatly reduce the exodus of many of our most experienced and valuable military men and women and help provide the quality of life our people in uniform deserve.

USE OF FORCE/U.S. RESOLVE

Reagan

Reagan's record is replete with examples of suggestions that force be used to temper international disturbances. While he was governor, Reagan called upon President Johnson to escalate the Vietnam war, using nuclear threats.

"...no one would cheerfully want to use atomic weapons...But...the last person in the world who should know we wouldn't use them is the enemy. He should go to bed every night being afraid that we might."

Los Angeles Times
July 3, 1967

Over the last 12 years, Reagan has suggested or implied that American military forces be sent to Angola, Cuba, Cyprus, Ecuador, Lebanon, the Middle East, North Korea, Pakistan, Portugal, Rhodesia, Vietnam (after our troops had been sent home) and has hinted at retaking the Panama Canal.

When questioned on his frequently used pledge -- "no more Taiwans, no more Vietnams" -- Reagan elaborated, describing the circumstances in which he would use combat troops, naval forces or air strikes to defend an ally:

"Well, it's a little bit like a Governor with the National Guard...You use whatever force is necessary to achieve the purpose..."

New York Times
June 2, 1980

Bush

We live in a nuclear age when no rational world leader can fail to recognize that a war between major powers risks the future existence of man on this planet.

Yet that risk hasn't deterred the leaders of the Soviet Union from aggression against its neighbor, Afghanistan -- or the reckless use of troops from its satellite, Cuba, in military ventures in the Middle East and Africa -- or from boldly placing a Soviet combat brigade in Cuba itself.

Certainly, the leaders of the Soviet Union don't seek a military confrontation with the United States. Throughout Soviet history, their penchant for aggression has always been for the easy, helpless mark -- from Poland in 1939, to Afghanistan in 1980.

But like Hitler at Danzig forty-one years ago, the Soviets' perception of the leading nation in the west as vacillating and militarily weak could one day result in a major power confrontation with unthinkable consequences.

The seizure of Danzig proved to be unacceptable to Britain and France. But Hitler miscalculated -- a miscalculation that led to war -- because the national leadership of Britain and France had already accepted the "unacceptable" in the seizure of the Rhineland, Austria and Czechoslovakia.

Forty-one years later, America's leadership has accepted what was once described as "unacceptable" -- the stationing of a Russian combat brigade in Cuba.

In and of itself, that brigade doesn't pose a critical threat to American security. But President Carter's erratic response to the Soviets' action in this instance -- a policy of bluff-and-backdown--could well lead the men in the Kremlin to some future miscalculation -- an act of aggression that would force an American president to take measures leading to the confrontation no one wants.

This is what Ronald Reagan means when he says "We must make unmistakably plain to all the world that we have no intention of compromising our principles, our beliefs or our freedom. Our reward will be world peace; there is no other way to have it."

World Affairs Council
September 5, 1980

Carter

The maintenance of national security is my first concern, as it has been for every President before me.

As I stated one year ago in Atlanta: "This is still a world of danger, a world in which democracy and freedom are still challenged, a world in which peace must be re-won every day."

We must have both the military power and the political will to deter our adversaries and to support our friends and allies.

We must pay whatever price is required to remain the strongest nation in the world. That price has increased as the military power of our major adversary has grown and its readiness to use that power been made all too evident in Afghanistan.

* * *

I see five basic goals for America in the world over the 1980's:

-- First, we will continue, as we have over the past three years, to build America's military strength and that of our allies and friends. Neither the Soviet Union nor any other nation will have reason to question our will to sustain the strongest and most flexible defense forces.

-- Second, we will pursue an active diplomacy in the world, working -- together with our friends and allies -- to resolve disputes through peaceful means and to make any aggressor pay a heavy price.

State of the Union Address
January, 1980

Carter

As I said in my State of the Union Address -- an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.

The purpose of my statement was to eliminate the possibility of any gross miscalculations by the Soviets about where our vital interests lie, or about our willingness to defend them. I am sure this is well understood.

Over the past year, we have made major strides in improving our capabilities to resist successfully further Soviet aggression in the region. Our efforts are designed to show the Soviets that we are both willing and able to deny them control over this vital region.

Persian Gulf Commitment

Carter

"Our world is one of conflicting hopes, ideologies and powers. It is a revolutionary world which requires confident, stable and powerful American leadership -- and that's what it is getting and that's what it will continue to get -- to shift the trend of history away from the specter of fragmentation and toward the promise of genuinely global cooperation and peace.

"So we must strive in our foreign policy to blend commitment to high ideals with a sober calculation of our own national interests.

"Unchanging American ideals are relevant to this troubling area of foreign policy and to this troubled era in which we live. Our society has always stood for political freedom. We have always fought for social justice and we have always recognized the necessity for pluralism. Those values of ours have a real meaning, not just in the past, 200 years ago or 20 years ago, but now, in a world that is no longer dominated by colonial empires and it demands a more equitable distribution of political and economic power.

"But in this age of revolutionary change, the opportunities for violence and for conflict have also grown. American power must be strong enough to deal with that danger and to promote our ideals and to defend our national interests.

"That's why the foreign policy which we've shaped over the last three years must be based simultaneously on the primacy of certain basic moral principles -- principles founded on the enhancement of human rights -- and on the preservation of an American military strength that is second to none. This fusion of principle and power is the only way to ensure global stability and peace while we accommodate to the inevitable and necessary reality of global change and progress."

World Affairs Council of Philadelphia
May 9, 1980

STEALTH

Reagan

Ronald Reagan charged yesterday that President Carter's administration compromised national security for "purely political purposes" and "a two-day headline" by leaking secret plans to build a new bomber that could evade radar.

Speaking to a businessmen's luncheon at an outdoor rally in Jacksonville, Florida on his first Southern trip of the fall campaign, the Republican presidential nominee accused the Pentagon of giving the editor of the Armed Forces Journal details of the top-secret "stealth" program, then calling a news conference to announce it "because of 'leaks' to the press."

The "leak" involved, he said, "some of the most tightly classified, most highly secret weapon information since the Manhattan Project" -- the development of the atomic bomb during World War II.

September 4, 1980

Statement at Jacksonville Rally

Bush

"Suddenly we hear of plans for a new weapon in our strategic arsenal -- the highly-classified "Stealth" bomber -- which we're told gives us an edge over the Soviets. And while the Defense Secretary professes outrage that information regarding this new weapon has been leaked, we can only wonder at the coincidence that the leak occurred at the very time that President Carter's re-election campaign was stressing his new-found interest in our national defense posture.

"All of this may sound and look reassuring in terms of our country's ability to conduct a foreign policy based on strength -- but to those who remember history, the desperation of these administration efforts is ominous."

World Affairs Council Speech
September 5, 1980

Carter

I had one question inside that I thought I'd better repeat to you all because you're going to get it in the transcript. I was asked about the Republican allegations concerning whether we have revealed the information about the Stealth airplane improperly. This is an absolutely irresponsible and false charge by Governor Reagan and by a carefully orchestrated group of Republicans.

As a matter of fact, no impropriety has been committed. The only thing that has been revealed about the Stealth development which is a major technological evolutionary development for our country, is the existence of the program itself. When I became President in 1977 the existence of the Stealth program then was not even classified. It was unclassified. Public testimony had been given on it and a contract to develop a Stealth device was done with an open and published contract. We classified the Stealth program in the springtime of 1977.

Since that time it has grown because of its importance and the major nature of it more than a hundredfold. Lately large numbers of people were involved in the knowledge of Stealth and also the development of it. Literally thousands of workers have been involved in this project and we have had to brief several dozen Members of the House and Senate and the crucial members of their staffs in preparation for large expenditures of funds for this major technological improvement in our nation's defense.

It's obvious that the Republicans have taken what is a major benefit to our country and tried to play cheap politics with it by alleging that we have violated our nation's security. The fact is that we have enhanced our nation's security and we took an unclassified program under the previous Republican administration, classified it, and have been successful for three years in keeping the entire system secret.

Statement to Newspapers
September 9, 1980

STEALTH

1. This is a major technological advantage to us. It is an important achievement that will affect the military balance in the coming years. It is one of a number of major technological advantages that the U.S. possesses. These technological advantages weigh heavily in the military balance and keep us second to none. In addition to stealth, these include anti-submarine warfare, precision guided munitions (smart bombs) and the cruise missile. We have publicly discussed our advantages in these other technologies in the past and will continue to do so in the future, because it is important that our potential enemies, our allies and the American people understand our military strengths. This is an essential factor in deterring war.

2. As with the other programs, we have kept secret the technical and operational details of stealth that give us an advantage.

3. Secrecy on the details of stealth combined with our technological achievements will enable us to keep ahead of the Soviets in this program for decades to come.

4. Programs to make aircraft less visible to radar have existed for 20 years. When this Administration came into office, stealth was a low-level technology program and its existence was not classified as secret. The program had been dealt with in open testimony and in open contracts. In the spring of 1977, stealth was turned into a major development and production program [do not say what vehicles we will produce] and the existence of the new program was classified at the highest level. The funding level is now more than 100 times larger than it was in early 1977 and there have been major achievements in the program.

5. Hundreds of contractor personnel are now working on stealth and over 40 members of Congress and Congressional staff members were briefed on the existence of the program and provided varying details about it before the August 11-14 leaks. The increasing size of the program and the increasing numbers of persons aware of it made certain that its existence would have come out in the near future.

[H.A.S.C. No. 94-8]

HEARINGS
ON
MILITARY POSTURE

AND

H.R. 3689

[H.R. 6674]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL
YEAR 1976 AND 1977

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Part 4 of 4 Parts

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SUB-
COMMITTEE TITLE II, H.R. 6674

HEARINGS HELD MARCH 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20,
21, 24, 25; AND APRIL 9, 11, AND 14, 1975



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1975

51-042 O

March 24, 197

4929

Written Statement of Dr. George H. Heilmeyer, Director,
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

INTRODUCTION

This is my first appearance before this Committee, having assumed my present position of Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in late-January. I would like to describe my background and what I bring to ARPA. I would also like to explain the role of ARPA, and my own view of the unique approach and contribution of ARPA to the solution of Defense problems. Finally, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will leave for the record a description and explanation of the ARPA programs that are included in the President's budget and respond to any questions the Committee may have concerning the program, my background and views.

I bring to this job a sense of commitment, a low tolerance for bureaucratic shuffling, a record as a market-oriented technologist and a determination to give the country a fair return on its R&D investment. I also bring a unique perspective to the job in that, in addition to my industrial R&D experience, I have also viewed ARPA from the vantage point of a position in the Office of the Director of

navigation systems. That is, am which we call HOWLS,

to ARPA by the Director hostile weapons location has ny or armies, I should say, npt to take a fresh look at

nd identification area is the work on what we call "sanc-

ced optics, as well as some ing systems.

apons location systems, the dvanced work that they are function, and not that this t was addressed when they perform this function.

ook like that an assessment ould be made?

nd radars under develop- mortar location. The kinds a major thrust or emphasis volve the use of distributed rh-value target like a radar distribute sensors which are h a radar on it. An RPV, . Several RPV's working in al communications signals

esent time we haven't even sometime in late fiscal year s particular point in time, ve a major impact in locat-

hich has a lot of attractive ar where the action is. It a given radar system. And e parts of the system on the sed to having them exposed

y good job of covering this nt and demonstration. We

may come back to you for programs.

n, Dr. Heilmeyer, in your

although not highly
 in its response. This
 costs involved in eliminating
 of the target. These detectors
 con tube and as a linear
 y several effects; including
 acturing or alignment
 sible response character-
 in. So long as these
 information they can in
 formative image, and
 tion by ARPA. An
 tive optical elements
 tions due to the fact that
 predictable manner. These
 ne quality of images for
 gh the atmosphere. The
 easurement of the distortion
 distortion.
 t promise for eliminating

certain degradations, they cannot in principle compensate for film or sensor errors since they act on the light before it reaches these elements. Thus, ARPA is also investigating postdetection compensation techniques which enhance an image after it has been formed and recorded. While these techniques are generally less efficient at correcting atmospherically induced errors, they are effective in removing blur due to instrument errors and in enhancing contrast in particular areas of the image. Here, ARPA's main thrust has been the development of computerized methods of blur removal when the precise mathematical representation of the cause of the blur is initially unknown.

The effectiveness and ability of offensive weapons systems to reach their targets are directly related to the susceptibility of the systems to early warning detection and track. The ability to control the radar cross section (RCS) of air vehicles can decrease their detectability and thus improve the overall effectiveness of offensive systems. Both passive and active techniques as well as vehicle design parameters are being employed to control RCS. Vehicle design practices have been established but are generally compromised by mission constraints in an actual design. Passive technology is fairly well established. The active techniques under

investigation, while as yet unproven, do offer the potential for high RCS reduction and minimum air vehicle redesign. To be effective the active RCS control technology must demonstrate adaptive wide band control through large variations in target aspect angles for targets which are roughly the same size as the incident energy wavelength. Several new techniques as well as new design practices are being evaluated to determine their capability to control RCS.

ARPA is currently developing advanced imaging radars operating at both microwave and laser frequencies. There are, however, limitations in resolution, image detail, and range. The first approach to overcome these limitations is ARPA's modification of the one hundred twenty foot diameter Haystack radar in Massachusetts by the addition of a new RF box and signal processing system. This system uses a more advanced form of the data processing technique previously developed. Operational testing at the system level is scheduled to begin in FY77. The second approach is the development of a wideband laser radar operating at 10.6 μm wavelength. Operational testing of the laser radar is scheduled to occur in FY78. Compared to the costs of the various concepts of the past decade, the ARPA investment in imaging radars has been extremely modest (\$28.4M FY72-75), while the information that has and will be provided is significant.

An RPV radar demonstration is being started to provide destroyer escort and smaller ships with ocean surveillance. This RPV radar could

August 9, 1976, Aerospace Daily

XST: Name being heard for the new stealth aircraft being built at Lockheed under sponsorship of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DAILY, July 23) is the XST, which may stand for "experimental, stealth (or silent), tactical." Aircraft also may have a new missile. Ben Rich, Kelly Johnson's successor as head of Lockheed's "Skunk Works," is playing the key role in the program. Johnson, although formally retired, has continued working two or three days a week at Lockheed and is given major credit for convincing the military that the plan can be built.

August 2, 1976, Aviation Week

Development of a small fighter intended to demonstrate 'stealth, or low signature, technologies under contract from Air Force Flight Dynamics Laboratory, funded by Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

May 5, 1975, Commerce Business Daily: Air Force gives
them copies of all contract summaries (p. 21 col 2)

A--HIGH STEALTH AIRCRAFT DESIGN STUDY.
Contr F-33615-75-C-2056 (F-33615-75-R2056)
funded by ASD/YRPHM, 513/255-4036 (A119),
Wright-Patterson, AFB, OH 45433

July 28, 1976, Aerospace Daily from an Air Force contract
(p. 19 col 3)

A--LOW RCS VEHICLE DESIGN HANDBOOK (Additional Work,
Time, and Money) Contr F-33615-75C-3094 (F-33615-75R3094)
funded by AFFDL/FES, 513 255-5066, Wright-Patterson AFB,
Oh 45433

[H.A.S.C. No. 95-4]

HEARINGS
ON
MILITARY POSTURE

AND
H.R. 5068
[H.R. 5970]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1978

BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Part 3 of 6 Parts
Book 2 of 2 Books

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
TITLE II

HEARINGS HELD FEBRUARY 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 25,
MARCH 7, 16, AND 28, 1977



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1977

83-874 O

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE H. HEILMEIER

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

TECHNOLOGICAL INITIATIVE ANDTHE NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUES OF THE 1980'S

I. INTRODUCTION

When I appeared before this committee last year, I outlined an investment strategy which focused on some key questions whose answers are deeply rooted in advanced technology. There is little doubt in my mind that these questions could become the national security issues of the 1980's. Let me review them briefly:

- Are there technologies on the horizon that could make possible a space-related use of high energy lasers and could such a laser system in the hands of the Soviets threaten our vital satellite network and strategic deterrent capability? Conversely, could such a laser serve the United States in some defensive way?
- Are there technologies on the horizon that can provide surveillance capable of detecting aircraft and warning us of missile launches?
- Is a new class of undersea surveillance systems possible that could detect and localize submerged submarines at great range with sufficient accuracy to target them? What are the limits of ocean hearing? Can the oceans really be made "transparent?"
- What is the nature of armor on the battlefield of the future? Are there technologies that could permit unique tradeoffs to the age-old parameters of mobility, agility, armor, and firepower? Could such technologies result in a new and better class of lower-cost armored vehicles?

- What can technology do about the seemingly endless spiral of increasing costs? For example, can we dramatically reduce the cost of jet engines by making them out of new types of ceramics instead of costly and strategically critical metallic superalloys? Can the sophistication and low cost represented by the pocket calculator and digital watch be used to simplify the maintenance problems of our equipment and make it more reliable?
- What are the technological initiatives in the command and control area that could enable us to use our current forces more effectively? For example, can packet switching, intelligent terminals, or computer-based decision aids significantly improve command and control?
- Can we develop a new class of airborne systems with the capability of "assured penetration" of enemy air defense systems?
- Are there technological breakthroughs possible which could lower the cost or greatly increase the speed, range, and endurance of small undersea vehicles?

Even two years ago some of these questions would have seemed like something out of a modern day Jules Verne novel. However, as a result of DARPA initiatives, while difficult technical problems remain, the technologies to answer each of these questions in the affirmative are on the horizon today and require little in the way of major, unknown, conceptual breakthroughs to make visionary answers to these questions a reality. But what are the implications to our security assuming that we or the

- Soviets are successful?

For a moment, I'd like you to consider:

- Space Defense - Both the United States and Russia depend heavily on space assets. Ponder the consequences of a space associated system that could protect our own satellite resources while possessing the capability to destroy enemy satellites in a surgical and timely manner.



THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

**PROGRAM OF
RESEARCH,
DEVELOPMENT
TEST AND
EVALUATION
FY 1978**

**STATEMENT
BY
THE HONORABLE
MALCOLM R. CURRIE
DIRECTOR OF
DEFENSE RESEARCH
AND ENGINEERING**

**TO THE 95th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION 1977**